EVALUATION

Bulletin

Fall 1993

Published semi-annually by the Central Evaluation Unit
United Nations

Contents:

Editorial by Leonor Maia-Sampaio, *Pages 1-2*

EVALUATION CULTURE AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation, *Pages 3-7*
Evaluation systems in some United Nations Agencies, *Pages 8-14*
Evaluation Culture and UNDP, *Page 15*
Evaluating nationally executed projects:
UNIDO, UNESCO and UNDP share their experiences, *Pages 16-17*
UNFPA and Evaluation by Henna Ong, *Pages 18-21*

USE OF INDICATORS IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Use of indicators in UNRWA by Abdul Ghani Khalil, *Pages 22-23*
Indicators for Economic Analysis, *Pages 24-25*
Use of Achievement Indicators on the Implementation of
the Global Strategy for Health for All, *Pages 27-29*

COMPUTERIZATION AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Computerized Databases on Evaluation, *Page 30*
Computerized Mailing Lists: Report of the
Working Group by Kenneth G. Ruffing, *Pages 31-33*

Note: **All articles for which no attribution is given were prepared and selected by the Editor.**

EDITORIAL

by Leonor Maia-Sampaio

"One should never turn back
from a chain of thought
because it might lead to heresy".
George Orwell

To fulfill the requirements of an evolving organization in an ever-changing world there is a need for honest judgment in communications with superiors, dispassionate analyses of facts, and competent professional conscience.

Neutrality and competence are fundamental elements that United Nations bureaucrats should bring to the attempt to achieve the stated goals of the Organization. The idea of "neutral competence" as described by H. Kaufman (1956) implies a wealth of knowledge and skills available in a bureaucracy that all officers in charge of the delivery of programmes, can call upon for both useful information and disinterested advice.1/ 2/

The recent observations of Lan and Rosenbloom in "Public Administration in Transition" are pertinent here. They make the point that, in effect, in large bureaucracies inspirational efficiency has been, to a large extent replaced by a political responsiveness not to Organizational goals but to individual demands which in turn leads to the rise of a new bureaucratic upper class characterized by immediate responsiveness but not particularly efficient in terms of neutrality or knowledge.3/ As Bahk and Gort point out, to redress this situation, an evaluation of the basic principles of organization has to be done, taking into account: "a) the matching of individuals and tasks based on knowledge derived from experience of the capacities and limitations of employees; b) accumulation of interdependent knowledge possessed by members of a team (or of a section) and not portable by any one member of the team

EVALUATION
Bulletin

Published by:
Central Evaluation Unit
Room S-2745
United Nations
New York, New York
10017, USA
Tel. (212) 963-6865
Fax. (212) 963-1211

Editor:
Leonor Maia-Sampaio

Designer:
Rodolfo P. Ortega

Litho in the United Nations, New York
December 1993
1,500

READEX
FICHE

or department; c) the development of interactions among employees; d) managerial learning reflected in improved scheduling and coordination among departments."4/

Although speedy response is desirable this quality should be considered on a par with skills in the analysis of facts that ultimately would enhance the work. These qualities should be based on a code of ethics not only applied in discharging equality in staff internal policy but also in report drafting.

Programme evaluators have an increasing responsibility to analyse the cost effectiveness of the delivery of programmes in the light of personal responsibility to ensure that proposals put forward are in no way shaped by self-interested rationales.5/

Footnotes

1/Kaufman, K., 1986, "Emerging Conflicts of the Doctrines, Public Administration. American Political Science Review, vol. 50 (Dec.), pps. 1087-1093

2/Wyler, G.A., 1990 Public Adm. and the Paradox of Professionalism, Public Adm. Rev., vol. 50 (Nov/Dec/55.637-653)

3/Zhyong Lan and David H. RoseNbloom, Public Adm. in Transition? Public Administration Review, Nov/Dec. 1992, Vol. 52., No. 6.

4/Byong-Hyong Bahk and M. Gort. New Plants, Journal of Political Economy, Summer 1993, p. 563.

5/Kearny, R.C. and Chandan Suha, 1988, Professionalism and Bureaucratic Responsiveness: Conflict of Compatibility, Public Administration Review, Vol. 48 (Jan/Feb) pps. 871-879. See also Rourke, F.F., and P.R. Schulman, 1989, Adhocracy in Policy Development, The Social Science Journal, Vol. 56, No. 2, pps. 131-142.

EVALUATION CULTURE AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation

The Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation (IAWG) was established in January 1984.[6/] Its objective was to provide a forum for discussion of evaluation issues by UNDP and the executing agency partners (see annex 1 for list of executing agencies) and to promote simplification and harmonization of evaluation reporting practices among UNDP and the executing agencies.

In the IAWG, the development practitioners discuss issues of evaluation policy and practices candidly without committint their agencies to any specific policy positions.

Members share experiences and information on evaluating technical cooperation programmes and projects, strengthening national capabilities, increasing their involvement in the evaluation process and developing practical solutions to problems. Technical information is shared with other operative bodies to which UNDP is invited as an observer, such as the DAC Group on Aid Evaluation. The accomplishments of the IAWG in the past seven meetings relate to two types of activity: (a) establishing compatibility and harmony within the member agencies (mainly during the period: 1984-1986); and (b) refining the substance and techniques of evaluation within the system (1987-1991).

Phase I: Compatibility and harmonization of procedures (1984-1986)

During this period, efforts were directed towards promotiong more effective evaluations by harmonizing the monitoring, evaluation and reporting procedures and designing an integrated approach for the technical cooperation system. It was necessary to establish harmony in procedures because of the different approaches to evaluation that existed within the system. The meetings focused initially on preparing a more effective interface between the needs of the financial sponsor(s) and executing agencies and the needs of project management such as governments. IAWG efforts to ensure greater harmonization of monitoring and evaluation in development projects resulted in a "Glossary of Evaluation Terms" and the "Guiding Principles for the Design and Use of Monitoring and Evaluation".

Phase II: Development of substance and techniques (1987-1991)

In this phase, the focus of the agenda shifted from customary to more distinctive items, such as lessons learned, identification of elements of success, evaluation of headquarters programmes, country programme monitoring and evaluation, guidelines on the proportion of resources to be devoted to evaluation, and the monitoring and evaluation of nationally executed projects. Over the past eight years, the IAWG on Evaluation examined the following issues: monitoring, evaluation and reporting procedures within the system; internal evaluations; tripartite reviews (TPRs); programme, thematic and ex-post evaluations; strengthening government capacity; and training. The focus of the agenda is the seventh meeting of the IAWG (1991) was on feedback of lessons learned, evaluation of headquarters programmes, country programme monitoring and evaluation, monitoring and evaluation of nationally executed projects, the Transfer of Knowledge through Expatriate Nationals (TOKTEN) and ex-post evaluation.

Level of participation

An analysis of participants indicates that the first and second meetings were attended by Secretary-Generals, Director-Generals, Special

6/The establishment of the IAWG was suggested by the Administrator of UNDP to the UNDP Governing Council in 1983, in connection with his proposal to set up the Central Evaluation Office (CEO) (see document UNDP/1CW.6

Representatives to the United Nations, Presidents, Managers, Executive Secrearies, Directors, Chiefs and Liaison Officers of United Nations specialized agencies. Beginning with the third meeting, operational topics were introduced and officials more directly involved with evaluation began to participate, such as Senior Officers and Chiefs of Evaluation Offices, Technial Cooperation Divisions and Programme Support Units.

Issues covered

Revised procedures

In 1984, revision of the monitoring, evaluation and reporting procedures was one of the two topics on the IAWG inaugural agenda. Procedures were field tested for 18 months in 12 countries and then revised to enhance effectiveness and efficiency and to develop a globally compatible and comprehensive system of evaluation and feedback for all member agencies.

Thematic evaluations and Programme Advisory Notes (PANs)

The second item on inaugural agenda in 1984 was thematic evaluations. The IAWG defined a thematic evaluation as the process by which the experience of United Nations agencies in analyzing and approaching major development problems was examined. An agreement was reached by member agencies on a number of basic issues relevant to this type of evaluation, including joint definitions of the subject under study, terms of reference, selection of countries and institutions, projects to be visited and personnel to be employed.

After thematic evaluations, PANs were prepared on the following themes: Aquaculture by FAO, UNDP and Government of Norway; Generalized System of Preferences and Trade Policy by UNCTAD and UNDP; Trade Information System by ITC and UNDP; Rural Small Industrial Enterprises by ILO, UNIDO, UNDP and the Netherlands; and Agro-Meteorology by WMO and UNDP.

Self-evaluation

By 1985, in the attempt to refine the revised procedures, internal evaluations had emerged as a new element deserving attention and were subsequently linked with TPRs. Project Directors were advised to undertake internal evaluations to improve quality of project management and facilitate the decision-making process of TPRs.

First evaluation of the IAWG

By 1986, an evaluation of the progress made by IAWG had been carried out by an independent consultant. The basic findings included:

(a) A genuine perception in the field of an integrated monitoring and evaluation system;

(b) An increasingly important role for national project officials;

(c) An understanding of the importance of the evaluation and design linkage;

(d) A serious lack of feedback to the project level;

(e) A perception of tripartite review participants as the primary users of the reporting process at the field level;

(f) Significant improvements in-depth evaluations, largely due to improved terms of reference; and

(g) Identification of training as the most important supporting action required for successful follow-up of the activities initated by the system.

Training

By 1986, training courses on the new procedures used in programme management, design and evaluation, were offeredf by UNDP and United Nations agencies to programme and support staff as well as to government officials. They focused on general principles that

emphasized the importance of problem identification in project design and established a direct linkage between design and evaluation at all points in the project and programme cycle. It was recognized that system-wide harmonization was feasible only for design and evaluation concepts. Training materials on substantive and sector-specific aspects could not be easily harmonized.

Ex-post evaluation

In 1986, experiences and problems in this area were shared by member agencies. In view of the nature of the activities covered by each agency, the need for specific evaluation plans for each agency was recognized.

Sustainability

This topic first emerged as an agenda item in 1988. The focus was on cross-cutting issues, such as Women in Development, environment, the prospects of promoting sustainability through twinning arrangements, the impact of technical assistance and identification of indicators of progress for measuring sustainability and cost-benefit techniques. Sustainability was identified as a part of larger issues, such as institutional development and national capacity, and the need for operational guidelines was recognized.

Monitoring and evaluation at programme level

By 1989, monitoring and evaluation at the programme level came to be recognized as a new concern, as assistance was increasingly provided through the medium of programmes rather than projects. The main issue examined was how best to optimize the contributions of specialized agencies to the monitoring and evaluation of programme assistance. Members agencies were invited to consider: (a) whether the current commonly agreed upon system for monitoring and evaluation needed to be modified and, if so, how; (b) what operational problems could be expected: (c) what concrete steps could be taken to mitigate such problems; and (d) the probability of increasing usage of cluster evaluations.

Feedback

In 1989, as a follow-up to discussions on evaluations, the issue of feedback was scrutinized. While lessons learned had always been a matter of concern to the group, few agencies expressed satisfaction with the effectiveness of the current feedback mechanisms. Feedback did take place at the project level, but further advances were needed at the programme and sectoral levels. Therefore, operational units were to identify examples of successful feedback of evaluation results. Harmonization of feedback was considered as essential.

Cost-effectiveness

Since 1989, cost-effectiveness has been a matter of continued concern for the IAWG. The discussion centered on whether the conditions necessary for a comprehensive analytical framework to render these concerns effective and efficient were in place, whether they were burdensome on headquarters staff and whether they were relevant to all projects irrespective of size, duration and purpose.

The members agreed on the importance of the issue, on the need to examine alternative modalities for project execution in terms of their proven effectiveness and estimated future costs, and the need to respect the country-and site-specific nature of technical cooperation. The application of cost-effectiveness to project technical assistance was to be examined more thoroughly. A simplified approach had to be developed for projects of significant size and duration.

The concern over cost-effectiveness in technical assistance in 1989 and 1991 led UNDP to invite an independent consultant to facilitate discussions among the group. It was agreed that the issue needed further investigation to reach a level of operational use. UNDP was requested to

produce an issue paper by the end of 1990 and prepare case studies in some sectors by June 1991.

National execution

By 1991, national execution was included in the agenda since this modality of project execution was being increasingly used by the United Nations development system. The IAWG examined areas that were appropriate for national execution, the issue of supervising project execution and ways by which specialized agencies could be optimally involved. Experiences and views were shared on enhancing the effectiveness of nationally executed projects and programmes through the strengthening of monitoring and evaluation capacities of governments.

As a result, the following areas were identified for further examination: (a) modification of the current monitoring and evaluation system for projects and programmes under national execution; and (b) points of entry for specialized agencies. Experiences of member agencies were to be synthesized by UNDP for further review in 1993.

Identification of elements of success

This subject was introduced in 1991 and appeared on the IAWG agenda the same year at the request of members of the group. No further information on the progress made in this area could be identified from the documents reviewed.

Evaluation of headquarters programmes

This issue was raised by UNIDO in 1991. Information was to be collected on the subject from member agencies. UNDP was assigned the task of distributing, within the group, results that were based on what each agency was doing and that would provide a basis for bilateral consultations. The subject is to be examined at the next IAWG.

Guidelines on proportion of resources for evaluation

In 1991, a concern about the correct proportion of programme resources to be devoted to evaluation was raised by UNDP. However, it was noted that given the diversity of programmes and institutions within the system, the basis for trying to establish a fixed norm for such distributions was insufficient.

Conclusions

The IAWG on Evaluation has been found to be a useful gathering that allow member agencies to exchange informally views and practices in evaluation, discuss related concepts and learn from each other's experiences. It has been successful in establishing an institutionalized forum for exchange and sharing among member agencies. The meetings provide a medium for communicating suggestions and resolving problems.

The group has succeeded in putting on its agenda certain key issues in evaluation, such as harmonization of procedures, and has since addressed emerging issues in the field, such as uniformity in evaluation strategies within member agencies, strengthening of national capacities for evaluation, national execution, cost-effectiveness, etc.

The harmonized monitoring, evaluation and reporting system, officially introduced in 1987, appears to have been the result of a genuine participatory process among member agencies and to have advanced satisfactorily. However, specialized agencies also indicate that the degree to which uniformity in procedures might be achieved is often influenced by the specialized nature of their own operational activities.

The Group is currently examining prospects for future harmonization, bearing in mind the complementary roles of member agencies in operational activities. This has led to a review of the subject of national execution.

The IAWG has also been pursuing the goal of achieving a common level of services from within the system to support programme monitoring and evaluation and to provide a standardized range of interventions by specialized agencies.

Efforts have also been made to harmonize training within member agencies. However, it is noted that a balance will be struck between the requirements of harmonization and the preservation of flexibility, since the nature of the technical services offered necessitates greater flexibility and harmonization, in the process of increasing efficiency, may limit this flexibility.

Less progress appears to have been made on sharing lessons learned through the evaluations of members agencies. In trying to identify elements of success, members expressed reservations regarding the practicality of the exercise, the consolidation of data from project evaluations, etc. This topic has, therefore, been postponed.

New concerns

The current concerns of the group are as follows:

(a) Feedback of evaluation results into operations, which has been left largely to the discretion of the concerned project managers or officers;

(b) Modification of the current system for the monitoring and evaluation of tehnical cooperation projects and progrmmes in the monitoring and evaluation of nationally executed projects and the strengthening of national capacity in evaluation;

(c) Establishment of an acceptable range of percentage of resources to be devoted to evaluation;

(d) Operational problems that can be expected while the evolution to programme-based monitoring and evaluation takes place, and the steps to be taken to mitigate these problems.

EVALUATION SYSTEMS IN SOME UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES

Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation (IAWG) meeting of 26-27 January 1993, Geneva)

Background

The Inter-Agency Working Group (IAWG) on Evaluation decided to collect and compile information on the composition, functions and other characteristics of the evaluation units of the member organizations. A questionnaire was drafted for this purpose by UNIDO, adopted by IAWG and was circulated to all the participating organizations in February 1992.

By the end of February 1993, a total of 17 organizations had returned completed questionnaires to UNDP. The organizations were:

FAO, ILO, UNIDO, UNDP, UNFPA, the former UNDTCD, UNCTAD, UNESCO, IAEA, IMO, ITC, UPU, UNRWA, INSTRAW, ESCAP, UNICEF and ITU.

This article provides an analysis of the responses to the questionnaire for IAWG.

The questionnaire was divided into six parts: organization, evaluation structure, monitoring system, evaluation system, appraisal and evaluation training. The analysis presented in this article follows this order as well.

Analysis of the responses

I. Organization

I.1. The introductory section sets out basic information about each participating organization: its title, general aims, governing and subsidiary bodies, membership and periodicity of meetings. No analysis was made of this part of the questionnaire, which is purely informative.

II. Evaluation Structure: unit responsible and organizational location (see Table 1).

II.1. Evaluation activities are generally centralized. In most organizations the evaluation office, under different titles is centrally located, usually in the office of the top management, as indicated below.

In FAO, the Evaluation Service (ES) is a part of the Office of Programme, Budget and Evaluation within the Office of the Director General.

In ILO, the Evaluation Unit (EU) is in the Bureau of Programming and Management.

In UNIDO, the Programme Development and Evaluation System (PDES) is located in the Office of the Director General.

In UNDP, the Central Evaluation Office (CEO) is located in the Bureau for Programme, Policy and Evaluation (BPPE).

In UNFPA, the Evaluation Branch is a part of the Technical and Evaluation Office.

In the former UNDTCD, the evaluation work was divided between two branches:

(a) The Country Programming and Evaluation Branch (CPEB) coordinated project evaluation work, and acted as the focal point for the evaluation of UNDP and UNFPA projects, and maintained contacts with the evaluation offices of UNDP and UNFPA.

(b) The Policy Coordination Branch (PCB) coordinated the monitoring and evaluation of programmes and sub-programmes under the regular budget, including Technical Cooperation activities. It maintained

contact with the Central Evaluation Unit of the United Nations.

In UNCTAD, the Programme Coordination and Evaluation Unit (PCEU) is located in the Programme Support and Management Service and reports directly to the Secretary-General on evaluation matters.

In UNESCO, the Central Programme Evaluation Unit (CPEU) is in the Bureau of Studies, Programming and Evaluation under the authority of the Deputy Director General.

In IAEA, the Evaluation Section (ES) is in the Department of Technical Cooperation and is responsible to the Deputy Director General.

In IMO, the Evaluation Unit (EU) is in the office of the Secretary-General.

In ITC, evaluation is a responsibility of the Executive Director.

In UPU, evaluation is decentralized within the Development Cooperation Divisions of UPU's International Bureau and functions on a regional basis, one section for Asia and the Pacific, Europe, and Latin America and the Caribbean, and another section for Africa and Arab countries.

In UNRWA, the Programme, Planning and Evaluation Office (PPEO) belongs to the Office of the Commissioner-General.

In ESCAP, the evaluation work is done by the Programme Planning and Coordination Office.

In UNICEF, the Evaluation and Research Office is an indepenent unit reporting to the Deputy Executive Director, Programmes.

II.2. Staff

II.2.1. FAO has the largest staff: 10 professionals (including Chief, D-1) and supported by 5 GS staff. Other larger organizations have 4 to 8 professionals: UNICEF 7 (influding one D-1) plus one Junior Professional Officer; UNIDO 5 (including one D-1); UNESCO 5, including a Head at D-1 level; ILO 4 plus 2 Associate experts; UNCTAD 2, including a D-1; IAEA and UNRWA each 3; UNDTCD 2; IMO, ITC and ITU one professional each; while UPU, INSTRAW and ESCAP have no separate staff for evaluation. The Central Evaluation Office in UNDP is headed by a Director at the D-2 level with a Deputy Director and 3 more professionals. UNFPA has one D-1 and 4 professionals.

II.3. Budget

II.3.1. Evaluation work is normally financed from an organization's own budget and project budgets. In some organizations there is no separate budget for evaluation.

II.3.2. Each of the following organizatios - FAO, UNDP, ILO, UNESCO and UNICEF - has approximately $1 million as its evaluation resources. Some of the Funds administered by UNDP have smaller budgets for evaluation (UNCDF, UNIFEM, UNV).

II.4. Functions

II.4.1. The functions of the evaluation units of the organizations are more or less similar with differences in emphasis and scope, depending on the character and size of the organization.

The common functions are:

development of evaluation concepts, methodology and procedures; guidance and assistance in evaluation for operational units; briefing evaluation consultants; participation in evaluation of projects/programmes; organizing and undertaking thematic/special evaluations; policy advice to management based on evaluation experience; reporting evaluation findings to management and governing bodies; feedback of evaluation to future projects/programs; planning and monitoring implementation of evaluation recommendations; design and participation in training on evaluation; development and maintenance of evaluation databases; contribution in programme/project appraisal process.

III. Monitoring Systems (see table 2)

III.1. Description, responsibility anu role of the evaluation unit

Monitoring in general is not a direct responsibility of the evaluation units of the organizations. It is the central function of the operational units, especially for field programme activities. For the regular budget activities, the Programme and Budget Office, in which the evaluation office is usually located, does the monitoring work, normally through semi-annual and annual reviews. However, the evaluation office often participates in tripartite reviews (TPRs), assists in backstopping of projects, and almost always monitors the evaluation system. In certain organizations, such as FAO, the regional offices carry some responsibilities for programme monitoring. The CEO in UNDP does not have any direct responsibility for monitoring Technical Cooperation activities at the country level but has developed guidelines to this end.

III.2. Breakdown of monitoring activities by Headquarters and Technical Cooperation project.

Answers to this question are inconclusive. The smaller organizations report no distinctions between Headquarters programmes and field projects. Even for bigger organizations, such a distinction is not too clear. UNIDO has reported that Headquarters programmes are monitored by individual managers in a non-structured manner, whereas in-depth evaluation of programmes is designed and carried out by the evaluation staff. In FAO, project operation officers monitor the project implementation process supported by a technical task force. Each unit plays a role in monitoring technical aspects. The Office of Internal Audit monitors financial aspects. In ILO, the Department of Technical Cooperaton is responsible for developing monitoring tools, including a management information system for monitoring the implementation of Technical Cooperation project activities. Technical departments, regional area offices, regional centres and regional advisers are responsible for the management and implementation aspects of individual projects. UNDTCD has stated that monitoring is an interactive process between Headquarters and field, which is ensured by continuous dialogues through the reporting system, correspondence, phone calls and field visits. In UNDP, CEO does have a responsibility to develop appropriate monitoring systems at all levels in association with the relevant units in UNDP and concerned executing agencies. The Planning and Coordination Office isresponsible for monitoring at the macro level, the regional bureaux at th regional level, and Resident Representatives at the country level. The UNDP-administered Funds monitor their own operations. Some of them have developed specific instruments for monitoring in addition to UNDP general guidelines. In UNFPA, monitoring of projects/programmes is the responsibility of the concerned geographic division. The Evaluation Branch provides technical assistance, upon request, in the design of built-up evaluation components of projects.

III.3. Monitoring documents

The usual monitoring reports are the following:

- Country Programme Management Plans (UNDP)
- Country Annual Report (UNICEF)
- Project Management Plans (UNFPA)
- Project Performance Evaluation Reports (PPERs) with comments of the evaluation staff and country representatives (UNIDO, ILO, UNTDCD, UNDP)
- TPRs (former UNDTCD, UNDP)
- Annual work plan reports (FAO, UNICEF)
- Annual reports on Technical Cooperation(UNIDO, ILO)
- Annual project review report (UNFPA, UNICEF)
- Semi-annual progress report by projectmanagement (ILO)
- Mid-term reviews of project management (ILO, FAO, UNDP, UNICEF)
- Terminal reports by project management (ILO, UNDP)

Most organizations, especially the smaller ones, follow the monitoring system based on UNDP

Project Performance Manuals (PPM) and do not have any other standard document.

III.4. Differences in monitoring system: UNDP and self-funded projects.

Most organizations have reported that there is no basic difference between the monitoring system for UNDP-funded and self-funded projects. However, FAO has mentioned that for non-UNDP, Trust funds projects, FAO conducts an FAO/donor review meeting annually and semi-annually with reports prepared by FAO. These serve the purpose of TPRs. In ILO, the delivery of multi-bi projects is monitored by the Accelerated Delivery and Monitoring System (ADMS), which aims at improving delivery.

IV. Evaluation System

IV.1. Main component, coverage and levels (self/in-depth/thematic) (Headquarters/Technical Cooperation)

The main components of evaluation activities reported are as follows:

(a) Self evaluation: its coverage varies: in FAO, all aspects of its work, annually by all Headquarters units and regional offices; in UNIDO, all Technical Cooperation projects; in UNESCO, internal evaluation; and outcome; in IMO, for activities of Headquarters by concerned divisions; and in UNRWA, self-directed evaluation carried out by programming and administrative managers.

(b) Review of selected regular programmes: in FAO, it is done by evaluation staff biennially.

(c) In-depth evaluation: in UNIDO, when requested by any of the 3 parties, usually of large projects; in FAO, in-depth evaluation of UNDP and Trust Fund projects; in UNESCO, when requested by the Executive Board; in IAEA, field evaluation reviews of complex and multi-purpose projects; in IMO, for selected activities.

(d) Thematic/special evaluation: this is mostly ad hoc, depending on the interest of the parties. Normally, it is done in association with donors and other concerned United Nations agencies. It may be on a selected programme or a theme of regular programme/field activities. It can be done by internal evaluation staff or by external consultants representing the parties.

In addition, FAO conducts field project/programme evaluations, primarily in the context of country programming. In 1988 UNIDO started selective headquarters programme evaluation done at the discretion of the evaluation staff. UNESCO conducts some evaluation work within the framework of its Integrated Scientific Programme.

UNCTAD classifies its evaluation work into policy-oriented evaluation at the intergovernmental level and management-oriented evaluation at the Secretariat level.

In UNDP, evaluations are done at the project, programme, strategic and policy levels. Project-level evaluations can be internal or independent, carried out at mid-term, terminal or ex-post stage of project implementation. There are also joint and concurrent evaluations with interested parties; cluster, sectoral/thematic evaluations at the country level; and evaluation of non-UNDP projects. Programme-level evaluations are for country or regional programmes and for sectoral/thematic programmes. Strategic-level evaluations are an assessment of UNDP Technical Cooperation approach in specific areas, themes or programmes. Policy-level evaluations are an assessment of UNDP current policy.

In UNICEF, evaluations are conducted at the project, programme, strategic and policy levels, all programme areas supported by UNICEF in a country are to be evaluated in the course of a specific country programme.

IV.2. Procedures and role of the evaluation unit.

This question overlaps that on the functions of the evaluation unit discussed under evaluation structure in Section II. The common features are

that the management of the individual project/programme evaluation is done by operational managers, and in-depth evaluation by the evaluation unit itself or with the help of consultants. In most cases, the evaluation unit provides oversight at all levels (direct participation depends on the situation) and ensures consistency with evaluation policies, norms and procedures. UNCTAD has developed work-sheets and forms for self-evaluation as well as for programme elements, sub-programmes and summary reports. In ITC, the Evaluation Office is responsible for all evaluation processes; planning, implementation and follow-up. Most organizations prepare periodic syntheses of evaluation findings. For UNDP evaluation, the procedures are laid down in the PPM chapter on evaluation and in the briefing kit.

IV.3. Reporting, follow-up and feedback.

The common instruments of reporting are the following: PPERs to managers, donors and recipients; self-evaluation reports to senior management; in-depth evaluation reports to the parties and some restricted distribution; thematic evaluation reports distributed widely; governing bodies receive reports on evaluation requested by them; reports of field programmes in selected areas reported to concerning technical committees and annual analyses of PPERs/in-depth evaluations distributed to managers and member countries.

Follow-up actions are reflected in the subsequent annual/biennial programme budgets and work plans. Follow-up actions for field projects are decided via TPRs. Beyond individual projects, lessons of evaluations are identified through synthesis exercises and feedback into the programmes as well as through the training courses on project design, formulation, operation and monitoring.

Many organizations have developed evaluation information systems to ensure that evalution results are analyzed, disseminated and used in decision-making and future planning at the level of project management, technical programming and high management. A computer database for retrieval/research has also been established in many organizations. In UNDP, the CEO has established a computerised database of approximately 900 evaluation reports, which are accessible through the Local Area Network (LAN) at the Headquarters. Evaluation lessons are disseminated through various publications, such as "Occasional Papers", "Findings" and "Feedback". CEO is presently launching an in-depth study of feedback mechanisms within UNDP to insure better use of evaluation results.

IV.4. Selection of evaluators.

In almost all cases, the selection of evaluators is done through a consultative process involving project/programme managers, technical staff and the evaluation office. For self-evaluation, the programme managers coordinate; and for in-depth evaluation, the evaluation office generally provides the leadership. Donors and other parties are also consulted.

IV.5. Difference in evaluation approach between UNDP and self-financed projects

No basic difference between the two approaches is reported by any organization. However, the ILO has reported that regular budget projects and multi-bi projects for $250,000 or more are subject to internal evaluation every 12-18 months and at the end of the projects, in so far as they are not subject to in-depth/interim or terminal evaluation.

V. Appraisal

V.1. Description

The common feature in the brief responses from the organizations is that appraisal is a decentralized system within the organization and the involvement of the evaluation unit is minimal and indirect.

In FAO, appraisal of field projects is conducted by teams composed of the Field Programme Development Division (DDF), operation unit and technical unit, with final responsibility resting with DDF. The emphasis is on technical and operational aspects. The evaluation service is not routinely involved. In

UNIDO, all projects financed by itself and UNDP-financed projects of $700,000 or more are subject to appraisal at Headquarters, using the UNDP checklist. ILO has no formal, organized appraisal system, but some formal procedures are applied before a project idea or project document is submitted to a potential donor to ensure that the project is properly designed and budgeted.

In UNDP, project appraisal is a major function, but it is done at various levels. The first stage is in the field/country where, after the initial appraisal by the concerned programme officer (following PPM), a project is considered by a formal Project Appraisal Committee (PAC) before submission to Headquarters. At Headquarters, the country officer in the regional bureau conducts an initial review, collects additional data for clarification and then submits the project for the clearance of the PAC of the Bureau. Finally, the project is considered for approval by a high level Action Committee chaired by the Administrator. In UNFPA, the geographic divisions do project/programme appraisals in consultation with its Technical Evaluation Division. The process begins with appraisal in the field office.

V.2. Unit responsible

Normally, the operational unit concerned coordinates appraisals with assistance from technical sections. The FAO and UNDP positions are noted above. UNIDO has a Project Appraisal Section in the Department for Programme and Project Development. In UNDTCD, each substantive office is responsible for appraisal of concerned projects. In IAEA, the concerned staff of the Technical Cooperation Programme Management (TCPM) and the Technical Cooperation Implementation Management (TCIM) do appraisals with assistance from technical staff. In ITC, project appraisal is the responsibility of the functional unit, while the Evaluation Office attends meetings of the Project Appraisal and Clearance Committee.

V.3. Staff

There was no reporting on this, except that UNIDO has 6 professionals, 3 General Service staff and one programme assistant for this function. In UNFPA, the Geographic Divisions vary in size from 5 to 10 professionals, depending on the region.

V.4. Difference in appraisal system between UNDP and self-financed projects.

There is basically no difference. A UNDP checklist is commonly used.

VI. Evaluation training

VI.1. Type, audience and frequency

Evaluation training focuses primarily on project design and evaluation, particularly in the larger agencies such as FAO, ILO and UNIDO. In UNESCO, evalution briefing is provided to all new programme specialists at Headquarters, to staff in the field units and field experts. There is also a seminar by (Bureau for Programme Planning and Evaluation) BPPE/CEU. UNCTAD has reported that its training has been more in the form of learning by doing, but its staff participated in the training course organized by the United Nations Central Evaluation Unit. Regional and country workshops are often organized by some agencies. Smaller agencies find that self-organized training is not cost-effective and they often send staff members for evaluation training organized by larger organizations. For example, ITC sends 4-5 staff members every year to ILO courses on project design and evaluation. In UNDP, the CEO staff has been actively involved in the training programme of UNDP in matters related to monitoring and evaluation in Headquarters and the field. However, such activities are becoming difficult to sustain due to limited staff. Despite this constraint, CEO continues to provide support to governments in their efforts to strengthen their monitoring and evaluation capacities through its publication of monographs.

The training courses are usually short. UNIDO runs 2-day workshops 3-4 times a year. FAO runs 2 courses: one on project formulation 2 times a year, and the other on operation and management of field projects 4-5 times a year. The former is open to FAO staff and the latter

specially for FAO field staff as well as national personnel. ILO holds 2-3 courses at the Headquarters, and on request holds seminars in the field. Until 1990 CEO of UNDP organized two training courses a year. Besides there were 2 study tours for government officials at UNDP Headquarters, to familiarize them with evaluation (for maximum three people). In UNFPA the principal modality is an annual course for national staff. UNICEF has developed a comprehensive package of training courses; the first course (one to two weeks) related to Programming Process workshop covers the role of monitoring and evaluation in UNICEF's programming cycle. The second course is a follow up to the first (one week to ten days) called the monitoring and evaluation workshop. It is organized at the field level. The third one is intended to develop capacity building at the field level for UNICEF staff and national counterparts (one month) on data collection, analysis and communications. The last one is organized at the regional level (six to ten weeks) on low cost essential research and evaluation methodology.

VI.2. Role of the Evaluation Unit in Training

Designing the courses, preparing the course materials and conducting the workshops are the normal contributions of the evaluation units to evaluation training. In UNRWA the staff of PPEO conduct training on monitoring and evaluation techniques in 5 fields of operation each year.

"EVALUATION CULTURE" and UNDP

In a recent international meeting on evaluation, the concept of "evaluation culture" was discussed by many agencies. The participant from UNDP, observed that an evaluation culture requires some or all of the following:

Location of the evaluation unit close to the decision-and policy-making level; emphasis on impact, effectiveness and sustainability in Technical Cooperation activities rather than delivery of inputs and outputs; adequate allocation of financial and human resources to evaluation activities; independence of the evaluation unit; a reasonable balance of evaluation activities responding to demand and supply; transparency of the results of evaluation; and, to some extent, the decentralization of the evaluation system.

Evaluating nationally executed projects: UNIDO, UNESCO and UNDP share their experiences

At the eighth inter-agency working group on evaluation, two very important issues emerged:

(a) whether it would be necessary to modify the current system for the monitoring and evaluation of projects and programmes to take into account the modality of national execution and (b) what the points of entry would be for specialized agencies.

UNIDO said that in its experience with nationally executed projects, the problems encountered were the same as those under traditional agency execution. For UNIDO, two issues needed to be addressed. One related to the management of the internal evaluation system Programme Performance Evaluation Report (PPER), including who would monitor and review the PPER, and how executing agencies could provide perspectives and modalities for involving executing agencies in in-depth evaluations. UNIDO offered its services to UNDP field offices in the monitoring of the internal evaluation system and the carrying out of in-depth evaluations.

UNESCO identified two basic conditions for optimizing the contribution of the specialized agencies in the area of Monitoring and Evaluation prior to project/programme commencement: (a) a minimum national infrastructure and the capacity for the M&E of the externally funded development assistance, and (b) a design in consultation with the relevant agency, for a comprehensive M&E plan prior to project approval.

UNESCO considered that the suggested points of entry proposed last year by UNDP were comprehensive. For UNESCO, the present common M&E system did not need to be modified specifically to cover the new modality of national execution. A suggestion was made to develop some indicators of capacity-building in monitoring and evaluation. Finally, UNESCO recommended that future documentation on the subject submitted at the IAWG be more operational.

At the meeting, UNDP circulated an issue of its publication "Feedback" related to the experience of UNDP with nationally executed projects and a directory of the central evaluation authorities of recipient countries.

The experience of UNDP resulted in conclusions related to the design, execution and achievement of nationally executed projects. Two basic recommendations emerged from the review. One related to the enhancement of the effectiveness of that modality (which confirmed UNESCO recommendations) and the second to the improvement of the M&E of nationally executed projects.

UNDP suggested the following topics for discussion in addition to those raised by UNIDO and UNESCO:

(a) How UNDP could help to develop technical assistance activities concerning monitoring and evaluation in response to the needs of recipient countries; (b) How evaluation units of executing agencies could develop these activities by themselves; and (c) Where executing agencies could promote those activities.

UNESCO suggested the development of a set of indicators of capacity-building in M&E. The issue of support costs successor arrangements was raised in relation to national execution and the use of the expertise of specialized agencies in M&E. Some agencies expressed concerns that the concept of the tripartite system was vanishing, replaced by a system based on a bilateral relationship between governments and UNDP. It was agreed that there was no need to revise the current guidelines on project evaluation as far as national execution was concerned. Many agencies requested that UNDP support greater involvement of the United Nations agencies in M&E for national execution.

In its response, UNDP recalled the General Assembly resolution 44/211 and Governing Council

decision 90/21 inviting UNDP to use the services of specialized agencies. Furthermore, the new context of decentralization and the need for greater accountability were powerful incentives for UNDP to rely on United Nations agencies for assessing and strengthening national capacities for M&E. For the UNDP representative, it was not the right time or the right place, to re-open the issue of national execution but it was the right place to see how services and expertise on M&E available in the United Nations agencies could support the national execution modality. Reference was also made by UNDP to the letter of the UNDP Associate Administrator inviting the Resident Representatives to consult the United Nations agencies in using Technical Support Service (TSS-2). It was recalled by UNDP that it was important that any agency proposals for funding evaluation activities under TSS-1 be backed by country demands and be endorsed by the senior management of the agency when submission was made to UNDP. There was no special channel through Central Evaluation Office (CEO). The UNDP representative underlined that the concept of national execution and the support costs arrangements required the United Nations agencies to adapt themselves to becoming mostly specialized non-executing agencies.

Follow-up actions

Some avenues for further investigation were suggested by CEO: a special window on TSS-1, a detailed menu of evaluation activities on TSS-1, and a directory of monitoring and evaluation services offered by agencies. CEO would develop the menu for evaluation in TSS-1 and invite the five agencies eligible for TSS to define the scope of services they could offer in TSS-1 and TSS-2.

Although there was no need to develop special guidelines for monitoring and evaluation in the context of national execution, it was suggested that some guidance to Regional Representatives and governments on the use of United Nations agencies might be desirable.

UNFPA AND EVALUATION

by Henna Ong

UNFPA - in the United Nations Population Fund - became operational in 1969. Today it is the largest source of multilateral funds for population programmes. Its income in 1992 totalled just under $250 million, provided by some 105 donor governments from both developing as well as developed countries. At the end of 1992, UNFPA was assisting 1,499 projects at country, regional and interregional levels; of these, 1,192 were located in developing countries. In financeial terms, some 49 per cent of its 1992 allocations supported family planning programmes. Other programme areas, in descending order of importance, were communication and education; basic data collection; population dynamics; formulation and evaluation of population policies; implementation of policies; multisector activities and special programmes.

Overview of the UNFPA Programming System

UNFPA provides financial assistance to countries, upon their request, within the context of national programmes which serve as the framework for achieving long-range population and development objectives. The UNFPA programming process is a regular cycle of four to five years, consisting of five sequential stages: programme review and strategy development; programme development; project formulation; appraisal and approval; and project implementation.

(1) The Programme Review and Strategy Development (PRSD) exercise, organized by UNFPA in cooperation with the Government, aims to develop a coherent framework for a national population programme. The exercise consists of an analysis of the current situation and needs, an assessment of past population activities, and recommendations for future action in terms of an overall national strategy. The specific objective is to generate a consensus around a comprehensive strategic framework for population activities.

(2) Programme development is the formulation of a multisectoral population programme based on the recommendations of the PRSD exercise. It identifies priority areas for UNFPA funding.

(3) Project formulation is undertaken within the national population programme's agreed-upon strategic framework, and the priorities defined by the approved UNFPA assistance programme.

(4) Project appraisal and approval may be carried out in the field and/or at UNFPA Headquarters, depending on the size of the project, its innovative character and its share of the total country programme.

(5) Project and programme implementation is the stage during which programme/project activities are carried out, and mechanisms for reporting, monitoring and evaluation are applied.

UNFPA also supports intercountry programmes through four regional programmes and an interregional programme. Intercountry programmes generally involve training, research, and awareness-creation activities. These are conducted at the intercountry level to provide economies of scale, to demonstrate innovative approaches on a pilot basis, or to serve as fora for exchanges of information and experience.

The primary objective of intercountry programmes is to complement and strengthen country programmes. They are developed through assessment and identification of the common needs of country programmes, as well as through consultations with United Nations organizations and NGOs that collaborate in executing UNFPA-assisted programmes. Intercountry programmes are reviewed and approved by the UNFPA Governing Council on a four-year cycle.

UNFPA Evaluation System

All UNFPA-assissted activities are subject to evaluation. The objectives of evaluation activities have remained essentially the same over the years. These are (not in order of priority):

1. To provide information and mechanisms to assist UNFPA, Governments and executing agencies in improving population programmes and projects;

2. To provide timely, analytical information for decision-making within UNFPA; and

3. To provide input to enable the UNFPA Executive Director to meet the requirements of accountability to the Governing Council.

UNFPA has a well established system for monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring has always been the responsibility of the programme staff while evaluation was in the early years of the Fund the exclusive domain of the evaluation unit. As evaluation became viewed increasingly as useful for managerial purposes and the importance of internal evaluation was acknowledged, it became clear that a coordinated system for monitoring and evaluation was required. Thus with effect from 1990, both programme and evaluation unit staff have been engaged in planning and implementing evaluation activities, their involvement being determined by the nature as ewll as scope of the evaluation concerned.

The present monitoring and evaluation system reflects changes necessitated by the decentralization of programming in general and monitoring in particular to the field offices. The Guidelines issued in late 1990 on monitoring and evaluation call for one report per year per project. In an effort to harmonize procedures in accordance with GA resolution 44/211, this report, called the Annual Project Report (APR), adopts the UNDP format with a minimum of alterations and includes items for both monitoring and evaluation.

The basic types of evaluation at UNFPA are:

a) Project evaluation

Projects are subject to mandatory regular evalution within the context of the APR. Section D of the APR calls for an assessment by project authorities of the performance of the project in attaining project objectives and the continued relevance of the project design, including the implementation plan. This analysis and its findings provide the basis for initiatives and/or corrective measures to improve project performance.

In addition, specific project evaluations may be conducted in mid-course or at the end of project implementation. The timing and methodology of these vary according to the size, complexity and substantive thrust of projects, as well as the specific purpose of the evaluation, e.g. to investigate specific problems in implementation or detemine whether a new phase of UNFPA support should be approved.

These evaluations are conducted by national or international consultants, or members of country support teams under the Technical Support Services arrangement.

b) Country programme evaluations

These are organised by the Geographic Divisions and may occur at the mid-term or near the end of a programming cycle as part of the larger PRSD exercise. In both instances, the country programme is analyzed from both the design as well as the implementation perspectives.

With regard to programme design issues, the coherence of the programme in terms of linkages between projects in the same sector as well as among projects in different sectors is a major focus of analysis. In addition, the attention given to the promotion of self-reliance and to address gender issues is also examined. The key implementation issues examined include the quality and adequacy of tehnical assistance provided; management and coordination of component projects and coordination with other population-related activities. The key factors that affect the pace and extent of implementation should also be identified.

In the case of end of programme evaluations, apart from an analysis of the actual programme performance in both financial and substantive terms, identifying facilitating and constraining factors, a brief synthesis of the results of component projects based on project evaluation reports should be provided. In addition, the major lessons learned are identified to serve as an input to the assessment of future needs.

c) Inter-country programme evaluations

These refer to evaluation of UNFPA-assisted interregional or regional activities which are executed by UN organizations or NGOs. The focus of these exercises varies according to the region, technical area and function concerned. In all instances, relevance to country level needs and activities is emphasized.

Evaluation of intercountry programmes are initiated and managed by the Geographic Divisions and/or the Technical and Evaluation Division. They are often conducted in collaboration with consultants or UN organisation staff.

d) Thematic evaluations

These are evaluations to assess, through case studies of projects and programmes, the experience with particular programme approaches, substantive topics and execution modalities. Themes are selected on the basis of the magnitude of past financial inputs, problems encountered in design and implementation over the years, the anticipated level of demand for cooperation in a substantive area and potential for contributing lessons for future programming. The topics to be examined through thematic evaluations are reviewed and approved on a biennial basis by the UNFPA Programme Committee.

The content and focus of each thematic evaluation vary with the subject matter. The analytical framework and methodology to be used are usually developed after a review of pertinent literature and consultations with programme as well as technical staff. In most cases the following issues are included: an overview of the basic problem(s) which UNFPA assistance endeavours to address; an examination of concepts and approaches used in UNFPA-supported activities; a synopsis of implementation issues, including the identification of reasons for success or failure in fulfilling objectives.

Thematic evaluations may be conducted as desk evaluations at UNFPA headquarters, or as a process involving both desk review of documents and field visits to conduct in situ assessment of projects selected as case studies. Such case studies are generally conducted in at least two regions. The output is a comprehensive report which synthesizes the findings of the individual field visits.

The Evaluation Branch of the Technical and Evaluation Division has action responsibility for conducting thematic evaluations, usually with the collaboration of consultants as evaluators. An Evaluation Officer is assigned as coordinator of each thematic evaluation. He/she has overall responsibility for designing as well as managing the exercise and participates in the field visits. He/she coordinates the preparation of the individual mission reports as well as the final synthesis report which is, technically, a report to and not by UNFPA.

A summary of the main findings and recommendations are presented to senior management within the UNFPA Programme Committee where decisions are taken on the responsibility and time frame for follow-up actions. Reports on thematic evaluations are generally printed and disseminated to field offices, concerned government authorities, UN organisations, non-governmental organisations working in the population field and interested academic institutions.

Feedback and use of evaluation results

UNFPA attaches special importance to promoting the use of evaluation results. This responsibility is shared by all units of the Fund. The Programme Committee and the Project Review Committee, in reviewing new programme and project proposals, require that the proposals

document the use of evaluation results in their preparation. The Governing Council has consistently provided UNFPA supported programmes. In this connection, the Fund submits a report on a biennial basis to the Council on its evaluation activities, their main findings and follow-up action taken.

Evaluation Data Base

In the late 80's, UNFPA established a lessons learned data base to facilitate feedback and utilisation of evaluation results in the programming process. With the availability of new technology and increasing decentralisation of programming and monitoring functions in UNFPA since then, it has become necessary to upgrade this data base. Efforts are underway to test and eventually establish a redesigned evaluation data base. The new system should on the one hand, make evaluation results more accessible and, on the other hand, enable monitoring of the quality of evaluations undertaken.

USE OF INDICATORS IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Use of Indicators in UNRWA

by Abdul Ghani Khalil

The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) provides education, health and relief and social services to more than 2.7 million Palestine refugees living in Jordan, Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic and in the occupied territory of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. To serve the needs of these people, UNRWA employs over 19,600 people including about 180 international staff. The headquarters of the Agency is located in Vienna, Austria with a Headquarters Branch in Amman, Jordan.

UNRWA established its Programme Planning and Evaluation Office (PPEO) in February 1988. Development and use of performance indicators aiming at improving management and programme planning started in 1991.

Performance indicators are important pieces of information at every stage of any programme management process. They are the managers' guidelines in defining specific needs, establishing meaningful objectives, monitoring progress, planning and designing self-evaluation activities and evaluating the results achieved.

Performance indicators were included in UNRWA's Four-Year Forward Planning document for 1994-1997 which was prepared by the PPEO in 1992. The Agency derived the indicators related to each of its three major programmes (Education, Health and Relief and Social Services), sub-programmes and administrative units from the available sources of information which include, inter alia, the annual reports of the programmes, the budget standards or norms, school examination scores, monthly operational reports and other Agency records such as patient visits to UNRWA clinics, repeaters rates in schools, special hardship cases as a percentage of refugee population, annual gas consumption per vehicle, etc..

In addition to the above sources PPEO collected further data through other methods including interviews with staff and beneficiaries of programmes and sub-programmes, direct observation of tasks/activities being carried out, and self-evaluation reports findings and recommendations.

UNRWA is using performance indicators as key guidelines for its forward planning documents and operational plans, and as basic criteria in its programme evaluation activities, etc. The following indicators have been selected from the 1994-1997 Forward Planning document to demonstrate some of the various uses of indicators referred to in the above paragraphs:

(a) Education Programme

The percentage of school-age Palestine refugee children (6-16) enrolled in UNRWA, government and private schools.

Results of standardized achievement tests conducted compared to minimum passing scores.

The number and percentage of the preceding year's vocational courses graduates who obtain jobs related to their training specialty.

(b) Health Programme

Infant mortality rate.

Crude birth rate.

(c) Relief and Social Services Programme

Number of Special Hardship Cases becoming self-sufficient through income-generation and/or skill training schemes.

Percentage of disabled persons identified through surveys as "in need" who are receiving services from Community Rehabilitation Centres or elsewhere.

(d) Administrative Units

Operational cost of all vehicles; average mileage and life time of vehicles; ordering/delivery time of supplies; budget expenditure control of supplies; and inventory and distribution control.

Number of new jobs created as a result of the income-generation schemes and loan delinquency and default rates.

In order to ensure the efficient and effective use of indicators (both quantity and quality indicators) in developing their programmes, activities and services, programme managers need to emphasize that the indicators adopted by their programmes are measurable, factual, valid and verifiable. They also need to organize training activities to disseminate information, to prepare background documents and to provide advice and assistance in applying indicators as standards to refine administrative procedures and develop management activities and services.

Indicators for Economic Analysis

(A statistical profile prepared by the UNCTAD Secretariat)

The use of indicators is particularly relevant in analysing quantitative factors. One example of how indicators can be put to good use is the statistical profile on the least developed countries prepared by the UNCTAD Secretariat.

The Statistical Profile was prepared in connection with the Second United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, Paris, 3 to 14 September 1990. It was meant to provide a handy form of reference by presenting in one sheet key indicators of development on the least developed countries (LDCs) as a group and individually. Researchers can see at a glance how LDCs rate on these indicators. Its end-users were supposed to be government officials, intergovernmental bodies, universities and research institutes but also the wider public, especially politicians, journalists, non-governmental organizations and other interested individuals, who can make use of the Profile for their discussion of issues relating to the development of the LDCs seminars, study groups and in the preparation of material for the media.

Definition of country groupings

The classification of countries and territories according to main economic areas used in this document was adopted for purposes of statistical convenience only and follows that used in the UNCTAD *Handbook of International Trade and Development Statistics, 1989*. Countries and territories are classified according to main economic areas as follows:

DMEC refers to *developed market-economy countries* and comprises the United States of America, Canada, EEC (Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom), EFTA (Austria, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland), Faeroe Islands, Gibraltar, Israel, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa.

DC refers to *developing countries and territories* and comprises all other countries, territories and areas in Africa, Asia (except China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Viet Nam), America, Europe (except Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Republic of Poland, Romaina, USSR) and Oceania.

Sources used

Most of the data presented here are taken from the *Basic Data on the Least Developed Countries* which appear in the annex to the *Least Developed Countries - 1989 Report* (TD/B/1248). The terms, definitions and sources used are set out in the explanatory notes to that annex. Some data, however, have been updated and therefore do not correspond to those shown in the *Basic Data on the Least Developed Countries*.

Other definitions and sources used are as follows:

Terms of trade data are estimates by the UNCTAD secretariat mainly derived from the UNCTAD *Handbook of International Trade and Development Statistics, Supplement, 1989*. "Terms of trade" is defined as the ratio of the export unit value index to the import unit value index.

Primary commodities refers to total non-fuel primary commodities; the sum of agricultural primary commodities and mineral commodities defined as SITC section 0, section 1, section 2 (less groups 233, 244, 266, 267), section 4, division 68 and item 522.56. The data are derived from the IMF, *Balance of Payments* tapes.

Indicators used

The indicators used for the study on least developed countries were organized under: major economic indicators, social indicators, demographic indicators, and debt indicators. These in turn were compared with DC and DMEC. The final table looked as follows:

LDCS AT A GLANCE: A Statistical Profile

LDCs		In comparison with: DC	DMEC
I. *Major economic indicators*			
GDP per capita 1987 (dollars)	227	921	15,610
Annual average rate of change of GDP per capita 1980-1988 [a] (%)	0.0	-0.1	2.3
GDP by economic activity, shares in 1987 (%)			
Agriculture	46	16	2
Industry	16	34	34
Services	38	50	64
Annual average rate of change of agricultural production per capita, 1980-1988 (%)	-0.8	0.0	-0.2
Active population in agriculture 1987 (per cent of total population)	73	56	6
Output per worker in agriculture (in 1987 dollars)	367	711	11,312
Share of investment in GDP 1987 (%)	14	22	21
Share of primary commodities in total exports 1987 (%)	56	22	15
Exports per capita 1988 (dollars)	22	215	2,461
Imports per capita 1988 (dollars)	45	215	2,577
II. *Social indicators*			
Adult literacy rate 1985 (%)	32	58	99
Rate of school enrolment 1987			
Primary (M,F,Total)	69,51,60	93,77,85	101,100,101
Secondary (M,F,Total)	21,11,16	46,32,39	92,92,92
Percentage of population with access to safe water 1988	41	80	99
Telephones per 1000 inhabitants 1987	3.0	29.3	603.0
Energy consumption per capita 1987 (kg of coal equivalent)	64	568	5,950
III. *Demographic indicators*			
Population 1988 (millions)	413	2698	807
Population growth 1980-1988 (%)	2.4	2.3	0.6
Life expectancy at birth 1985-1990 [b] (years)	49	59	75
Infant mortality rate 1985-1990 [b] (per 1000 live births)	122	86	11
IV. *Debt indicators*			
Total net flow of ODA 1988 ($ billion)	12	45	
Per capita ODA 1988 (dollars)	30	17	
Debt/GDP ratio 1987 (%)	72	49	
Debt service/exports ratio 1987 (%)	27	23	

[a] Preliminary figures [b] Projections

USE OF ACHIEVEMENT INDICATORS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR HEALTH FOR ALL BY THE YEAR 2000 GLOBAL REVIEW

World Health Organization

Introduction

The second evaluation of the implementation of the Global Strategy for Health for All by the Year 2000 was carried out by WHO Member States during the last quarter of 1990 and the first quarter of 1991, and the regional syntheses of findings from the national reports were approved by the Regional Committee of each of the six WHO regions during September and October 1991. In May 1992, the Forty-fifth World Health Assembly approved the global review[a] based on the regional and national reports as well as on other sources, especially information from WHO technical programmes and documents prepared by other organizations of the United Nations system. The report on the *Implementaton of the Global Strategy for Health for All by the Year 2000, second evaluation; and eighth report on the world health situation*, consists of this global review and the six regional reports. Countries were asked to provide data for the reference period (1988-1990), and for the global review these were compared with the data for 1985, when the first evaluation was carried out. In order to monitor and evaluate progress in the implementation of their national strategies for health for all (HFA), WHO Member States have agreed to provide information periodically on a set of global indicators devised for this purpose; the list of indicators approved by the Executive Board in 1990 for the second HFA evaluation (resolution EB85.R5) is given below. These indicators were incorporated into a document *(Common Framework for the Second Evaluation (CFE/2)* prepared to assist Member States in collecting and analysing relevant information for the evaluation of their strategies.

This section of the *Annual* presents a summary of the detailed analysis of replies concerning the global indicators contained in the 151 (out of a possible 168) national reports sent to WHO.[b] It covers three aspects: (i) the availability of data related to the global indicators, (ii) assessment of national achievements from a global perspective; and (iii) outlook for the future.

List of reformulated global indicators

No. 1 The number of countries in which health for all is continuing to receive endorsement as policy at the highest level.

No. 2 The number of countries in which mechanisms for involving people in the implementation of strategies are fully functioning or are being further developed.

No. 3 The percentage of gross national product spent on health.

No. 4 The percentage of the national health expenditure devoted to local health services.

[a] Resolution WHA45.4.

[b] WHO Member States numbered 168 at the end of 1990

No. 5 The number of countries in which resources for primary health care **are becoming more** equitably distributed.

No. 6 **The amount of international aid received or given for health.**

No. 7 **The percentage of** the population **covered** by primary health care, with at least the following:

- safe water in the home or **with reasonable access**, and adequate **excreta-disposal** facilities **available;**

- immunization against diphtheria, tetanus, whooping-cough, measles, poliomyelitis, and tuberculosis;

- local health **services**, including availability of essential drugs, within one hour's walk or travel;

- **attendance by** trained personnel for pregnancy and childbirth, and caring for children up to at least 1 year of age.

The percentage of women of child-bearing age using family planning.
The percentage of each element should be given for all identifiable subgroups.

No. 8 **The percentage of newborns weighing** at least 2 500 grams **at birth**, and **the percentage of children whose** weight-for-age **and/or weight-for-height are acceptable.**

No. 9 The infant mortality rate (IMR), **maternal mortality rate (MMR) and probability of dying before the age of 5 years (q5),** in all identifiable subgroups.

No. 10 Life expectancy at birth, **by sex, in all identifiable subgroups.**

No. 11 The adult literacy rate, **by sex, in all identifiable subgroups.**

No. 12 The **per capita** gross national product.

National response and data availability

The second evaluation has been characterized by the greater preparedness of countries which were more involved in the process and more thorough in reviewing their products, viz. conclusions and their implications for further action. Countries seem to have felt a greater sense of involvement in what they perceived as their own evaluaton rather than just WHO's.
Table 1 shows the response rates by country for the previous monitoring and evaluation and for the current evaluation for which reports were submitted by 151 countries, covering 5.2 billion people or 96% of the world population.

Table 1. Monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the Strategy for health for all by the year 2000: reports from WHO Member States, 1983-1991

	1st monitg. 1983	1st eval. 1985	2nd monitg. 1988	2nd eval. 1991
Member States				
Number	160	166	166	168
Reports recd.	121	147	143	151
Response rate(%)	75.6	88.6	86.1	89.9
Non Member States				
Reports recd.	1	15	17	9

For the first time, the global review presents an analysis of the availability and timeliness of data on the global indicators provided by Member States. Data have been classified in one of the following groups:

(a) Data/information provided, and referring to the period 1988-1990, i.e. the reference period for the second HFA evaluation.

(b) Data/information provided, but referring to a period prior to 1988.

(c) No data/information provided or, if provided, not in the required format (e.g. only data for urban areas provided although the indicator pertained to the whole country).

(d) No data/information requested - this relates only to Member States covered by the WHO Regional Office for Europe.

COMPUTERIZATION AT THE UNITED NATIONS

COMPUTERIZED DATABASES ON EVALUATION

During the Eighth meeting of the Inter-Agency Working Group on Evaluation agencies who have established computerized databases on evaluation (UNDP, FAO, ILO, World Bank, UNICEF and UNESCO) shared their experiences with many agencies who still has non-computerized databases.

The agencies that had established databases agreed that:

(a) the textual information extracted from evaluation reports could not be a substitute for the reading of the full evaluation report. However, it provided basic data that could facilitate any preliminary search, such as the sorting of good evaluation reports or good term of references for evaluation and preparation of a full reciew of reports related to a specific theme or sector;

(b) the quantitative data generated by the recording of evaluation reports in the database offered relevant material for any statistical study and trend analysis of evaluation;

(c) the project evaluation data sheet, used for extracting data from an evaluation report, needed to be adjusted frequently to improve the quality and relevance of the data extracted and to respond to new concerns;

(d) The Group also considered the issues of the use of a database, its limitations in terms of content, its user-friendly access and the derestriction of data.

Follow-up actions

Those agencies that already had a database gained the sense of commonalities and differences while those that were planning to establish a database learned some useful lessons. It was clear from the discussion that agencies were interested in continuing the exchange of experiences and data on a bilateral basis.

COMPUTERIZED MAILING LISTS: REPORT OF THE DESD WORKING GROUP

by Kenneth G. Ruffing

Most United Nations Departments have problems associated with mailing lists. These have been discussed in several in-depth evaluation reports (See, for example, E/AC.51/1989/4 and E/AC. 51/1990/2). More recently, the Central Evaluation Unit concluded that "customized mailing lists are essential not only for reaching ... intended users effectively but also for the efficient utilization of limited resources. For these purposes, it is desirable to establish a computerized database with sorting capability". (Evaluation Bulletin vol. 1, No. 1 Summer 1992). Moreover in its Report 3 of December 1992 the Working Group on Publications Policy recommended that all official and departmental distribution lists should be computerized, reviewed and updated frequently, and incorporated into the "centralized computer data base" maintained by the Distribution Section in the Publications Division of the Office of Conference Services. (OCS)

The goal of the DESD Working Group was to evaluate the situation regarding the maintenance and use of mailing lists within the Department and to make suggestions for its improvement so as to give practical effect to the recommendations mentioned above.

Participants in the Department of Economic and Social Development (DESD) Working Group provided information on mailing lists maintained by them or maintained by the Distribution Section on their instructions. It was determined that about 23 lists containing about 20,000 names were being maintained by various units within the Department. Of the total number of lists, 5 were maintained by the Distribution Section which updated them upon receipt of instructions to add or delete names. Perhaps as many as 10 work/months were required to update these files by DESD and about 7 months were required for Departmental mailings in addition to those undertaken on behalf of the Departments by the Distribution Section.

Participants noted that there was no easy way to use Departmental systems for creating specialized mailing lists, for eliminating duplication among contacts included in the various lists, or for accessing a large centralized data base from which smaller customized data bases could be developed. The problem at the Departmental level was seen as the need to improve the effectiveness of its outreach activities rather than reducing the amount of staff time involved which was, in fact, fairly little.

Relevant to any strategy to improve the effective use of mailing lists at the departmental level at Headquarters were the activities of the Distribution Section of the Publications Division and the Dissemination Division of the Department of Public Information, representatives of which provided briefings to the DESD Working Group.

Activities of the Distribution Section.

The Distribution Section maintains a computerized addressing system based on a WANG VS-65. Addresses may be printed directly on envelopes, on labels affixed to envelopes, on shrink wrapping, and on "strip lists" for purposes of reviewing the addresses. Instructions for the use of this system can be sent on-line through an Asynchronous Data Interface (ADI) link using the Documentation, Retrieval, Information and Tracking System (DRITS). The Distribution Section maintains 65 lists for the Office of Conference Services and an additional 135 lists on behalf of other Departments. The 190 lists include 66,000 addresses.

There are a number of shortcomings in the mailing list system of Distribution Section. These lists have not been consolidated into a truly centralized lists which would surely result in the elimination of much duplication. While they are maintained by means of the same software package (EZ-list 3.0 soon to be upgraded to 4.1), they contain only information crucial for mailing, but not other information which a flexible system should have such as telecommunication and other descriptive information required for developing selection criteria for purposes of preparing

specialized or targeted mailing lists. The maintenance of parallel lists rather than a truly centralized system undoubtedly occupies considerable time of the over 115 full time staff in the Distribution Section. In fact, the Distribution Section itself is currently hard pressed to meet existing demands and is reluctant to agree to maintain additional lists for author Departments except on a chargeback-for-overtime basis.

A further drawback to the limited capabilities of the software in use by the Distribution Section combined with the absence of a centralized system for UN Headquarters is that no author department can obtain a consolidated list of all of the recipients of its information products, including, for example, Secretariat Staff, delegations, United Nations Information Centres (UNICs), recipients of sales publication versions, and recipients of free distribution.

Activities of the Department for Public Information

The Department of Public Information (DPI) completed the first phase of a centralized Contact and Mailing List System (CML) in 1991. This system was designed using structured relational data base concepts. It was implemented in PACE software for a Wang minicomputer. The UNICs around the world provided information on their regional contacts in a questionnaire designed at Headquarters (attached). The database contains addresses and other information on 8000 non-duplicative contacts. It can be sorted on a wide variety of descriptive fields including, e.g., organization type, organization size, and type of information sought. To facilitate decentralization of the updating process, a pilot PC version has been developed in dBase IV and distributed for testing to several UNICs.

There are a few drawbacks to the Department of Public Information centralized data base. It has not been maintained for the last year and a half because of uncertainties arising from changes in the upper echelon of the Department of Public Information and the reorganization of the Secretariat. While containing a great deal of information provided by the UNIC's, information-product project managers in other divisions of the Department of Public Information Headquarters have not converted their separately maintained mailing lists to the central system which has therefore not reached its full potential even within the Department of Public Information. Computer programming staff responsible for the development of the CML system have been reassigned to other tasks and are not presently available to make further improvements to the system. Another drawback is that the PC version of CML was implemented in dBase IV while Paradox is the PC-based relational data base product supported by the Office Automation Section.

Based on the computer software and hardware available in the Distribution Section of OCS and in the Dissemination Division of DPI, the DESD Working Group makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1. Heads of DESD successor departments should require each mailing list manager to migrate its data to the dBase IV version of the CML software developed by DPI. This step alone would permit exchange of data among the various mailing lists maintained in each of the DESD successor departments. By prior agreement with DPI, Ms. L. Dua, Social Science Research Assistance, Division for Policy Development (DPCSD) will provide a copy of the software to interested users.

Recommendation 2. A pilot PC version of an enhanced CML system (CML2.0) should be implemented in Paradox 4.0. This version should be designed to accept CML files from the existing PACE or dBase IV versions. It should also have a few additional relational data bases added to the system. (See annex 1 for a provisional list of the relational data bases to be included in the enhanced version). The additional data bases would facilitate decentralized maintenance of a centralized mailing list and adequate communication with the Distribution Section. It is proposed that the pilot Paradox version be developed by the Division for Policy Development in DPCSD under the general

guidance of Mr. K.G. Ruffing, Assistant Director.

Recommendation 3. Once the pilot version is thoroughly tested by author departments, DPI and the Distribution Section, it should be maintained by the Office Automation Section for use by all UN Headquarters Departments.

Recommendation 4. A core centralized mailing list should be established by the Dissemination Division of the Department of Public Information and the Distribution Section of OCS. The software developed by Department of Public Information should be used for storing all data, with the responsibility for maintaining data divided between Department of Public Information, OCS and author departments. A bridge programme should be written to extract the data from CML required to operate the computerized addressing equipment possibility by inputting data to EZ-list 4.1.

Recommendation 5. To implement recommendation 4 the Dissemination Section, Department of Public Information and the Distribution Section, OCS, should agree on a minimum set of modifications to the CML and EZ-list implementations, as well as to other software which controls the automated addressing machinery. For example, CML allows for mailing labels of up to 9 lines, but the automated addressing machinery is limited by its current software to 6 lines (a new version of the same software does allow for 9 lines and should be installed). CML, on the other hand, allows for up to 5 separate language counts, but the EZ-list implementation allows for 6. In this case the CML should be modified.

Obviously, the implementation of all 5 recommendations would require extensive interdepartmental agreement. Recommendations 1 and 2, however, can be carried out by decisions at the level of the Office of the Under-Secretary General for each successor department to DESD acting on his own initiative, and in some cases even at the level of Assistant Director within some divisions. Recommendation 3 would require the agreement of the Electronic Services Division. Recommendations 4 and 5 would require the interdepartmental agreement of the Department of Public Information and the Department of Administration and Management. Nonetheless, the effort should be made since the costs involved are small -- most of the tools exist -- and the benefits in the form of streamlined, effective dissemination appear to be potentially large.

Annex 1

Preliminary Identification of Contents of Relational Data Base for a Common Denominator Computerized Mailing List and Contact System

1. Contact Basic Information

This would contain all information on the CML form designed by Department of Public Information with the following additions:

- author department-assigned contact id number (to facilitate decentralized maintenance; provision is already made for a centrally-assigned contact id number);

- contact E-mail address;

- name and number of copies for 6th UN language requested (to improve compatibility with Distribution Section norms).

2. Country codes and regional relations (as in current CML system)

3. Organization codes and descriptions (as in current CML system)

4. UNIC codes and related information (as in current CML system)

5. Language codes and descriptions (as in current CML system)

6. Region codes and descriptions (as in current CML system)

7. Subject matter codes and descriptions (as in current CML system)